

REMARKS

1. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 5-14, and 17-31 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims and the remaining are dependent claims. The Applicant believes that the rejections contained in the Office Action have been overcome as discussed below.

2. Response to Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 17-25, and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,010,922 to Heller et al. ("Heller") in view of U.S. Design Patent No. 495,536 to Lucht, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,415,475 to Goodman. The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heller in view of Lucht, in further view of Goodman, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,081,012 to Wallace ("Wallace"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests favorable reconsideration.

In claim 1, Applicants claim, *inter alia*, a base with a dome configuration with a plurality of unitary support veins extending from a central hub. Similarly, in claim 19, Applicants claim, *inter alia*, a base with a plurality of unitary support veins located on the underside of a base and extending from a central hub. As stated by the Examiner, Heller fails to disclose "wherein the base having a dome configuration, and a plurality of unitary support veins extend from the central hub and is located underside of the base." (Office Action, page 3, para. 1). Consequently, Lucht is cited for the proposition that Lucht discloses "wherein the base having a dome configuration (fig. 7); [and,] a plurality of unitary support veins extend from the central hub and is located underside of the base (fig. 8)". (*Id.*) However, Applicants respectfully submit

that Lucht fails to describe unitary support veins. Figure 2 of Lucht illustrates the same base as Figure 8 of Lucht, but from a different view. In Figure 2, it is apparent that the structures cited from Figure 8 are not support veins, but rather grooves into the base itself. As grooves are commonly known to function as stress risers, thus weakening the base, the grooves could not be considered support veins. Further, one would not have been motivated to modify the base of Heller with a base as taught by Lucht to enhance the structural strength and rigidity of the base because the grooves of Lucht actually weaken the base instead.


Because Lucht does not disclose, teach, or suggest the element of unitary support veins, the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 19. Without addressing the merits of the Examiner's arguments regarding claims 5-14, 17-18, and 20-31, which are not conceded, Applicants point out that these claims depend from and include all of the limitations of claims 1 or 19. Therefore, these claims distinguish the cited reference for the same reasons discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 19. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 5-14, and 17-31.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative below if any questions arise or if he may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
McDONNEL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: 5/29/07


James McCarthy
Reg. No. 39,296